UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,509	08/01/2003	Letian Chen	1033-SS00416	4334

60533 7590 10/24/2008

TOLER LAW GROUP
8500 BLUFFSTONE COVE
SUITE A201
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER	
CUMARASEGARAN, VERN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3629	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/632,509	CHEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	VERN CUMARASEGARAN	3629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8,10-18,21 and 22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8, 10-18, 21, 22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8, 10-18, 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Florance et al. (US 2002/0065739 A1) in view of Mukundan et al (US 6,907,451 B1).

As to claim 1, Florance et al show a persistence layer (Fig.1, A16) that stores a plurality of properties in a computer-readable storage medium (paragraph 425 "...memory means for storing data...");

an application layer that offers services to applications having a variable dependent on one of the plurality of properties (Fig.1 A14 where an application such as the market analytics application would be dependent on a plurality of properties), the services being offered through an application programming interface provided by the application layer, the services including notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received (paragraph 52 where updates are sent to clients); and

a interface layer that accepts user input to update properties stored by the persistence layer (Fig.73), wherein the interface layer notifies the application layer of the update for the particular property (paragraph 54).

As to claim 2, Mukundal et al show an application class including a property listener that receives the notification, the property listener including a list of property keys of interest to the application second property listener that can modify variables in the second software application without having to restart the second software application (col.42-43 lines 60-9 where "marked fields" are considered to be keys of interest).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Florance et al and incorporate the method of Mukundal et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

As to claim 3, Mukundal et al show an application layer that maintains a lookup table that records, for each of a plurality of property keys, a list of property listeners that have registered with the application layer to listen for that property key (col.41 lines 13-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Florance et al and incorporate the method of Mukundal et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination

were predictable.

As to claims 4 and 5, Florance et al show application class of a middleware application (Fig.1 *where database application is considered middleware*).

As to claim 6, Florance et al show application layer being contained within a common project within middleware (Fig.1).

As to claim 7, Mukundal et al show application layer being contained in a client JAVA file (col.4, lines 52-59).

As to claim 8, Mukundal et al show dynamic link library (Fig.13 *where runtime library is considered dynamic link library*).

As to claims 10, 11, 14 and 16, Florance et al show displaying of property information (paragraph 148 *where the type of information is considered non-functional descriptive language and thus is not given patentable weight*).

As to claims 12, 13 and 15, Florance et al show accepting user input to update property information (Fig.1).

As to claim 17, Florance et al show interface layer comprising a web interface layer (Fig.2).

As to claim 18, it is old and well known in the art to display information in a searchable format. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of searchable display of information since it is merely a combination of old elements.

As to claims 21 and 22, Florance et al show accepting, into an interface layer of a property-manager system, user input to update a first property stored in a computer-

readable storage medium, the first property including a name- value pair (Fig.1);
in response to accepting the user input, notifying an application layer of the system of the updated first property, the application layer offering services to applications that have a variable dependent on the first property, the services being offered through an application programming interface provided by the application layer, the services including notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when an update for the particular property is received (paragraph 52); and
in response to the application layer being notified of the updated first property, notifying an application having a variable dependent on the first property of the updated first property, wherein the notifying the application is performed by the application layer (paragraph 54).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed June 18, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Contrary to applicant's assertions, Florance et al teach "notifying an application having a variable dependent on a particular property when a notification of an update for the particular property is received in paragraph 52 where data updates are sent to users. Examiner respectfully disagrees with the assertion that the references fail to teach a "computer readable program code executable by a computer." Both Florance et al and Mukundan et al inherently teach a computer readable program code executable by a computer since their entire invention is based on a software application that is executed on a computer.

Rejection regarding the 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph is withdrawn since the language noted in the said rejection has been removed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VERN CUMARASEGARAN whose telephone number is (571)270-3273. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Vc

/John G. Weiss/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3629